

respectfully traversed. The comments made with respect to Molloy in the previous response are incorporated herein by reference.

Contrary to the allegations set forth in the Office Action, there is no teaching or suggestion in Molloy of the specifically claimed features of *providing a store of previously constructed queries or selecting between an originally constructed query and a query from the store that is identified by a search tool, as set forth in the claims*. As indicated in the previous response, Molloy does not disclose or suggest a number of specifically claimed features of the instant invention. For example, Molloy does not disclose or suggest a store for database queries as set forth in the claimed invention. In particular, according to Molloy, the queries are simply submitted to a conventional case-based database so as to retrieve an ordered list of results (referred to as "concepts" in Molloy, see, e.g., Col. 4, lines 29-38). The system of Molloy provides an arrangement by which a dialog can occur between the user and the database in a cyclical fashion so as to allow the adaptive learning system to present the most relevant results to the user (see Col. 13, lines 26-43). However, the results from the database are not queries in the context of the claimed invention, but instead relate to the information for assisting a help desk for maintaining a network since the cases relate to problems in the network together with associated diagnosis and implemented solution. Consequently, there is no disclosure in Molloy of searching a store of database queries against a constructed query. Additionally, Molloy fails to disclose or suggest the feature of selecting between the originally constructed query and a query located by a search of the stored queries, so as to then submit the selected query to a database. In complete distinction, in Molloy, the final results of the search are simply presented to the help desk operator so they can advise

appropriately on the solution to a network problem. *There is simply no teaching or suggestion anywhere in Molloy of providing a store of previously constructed queries or selecting between an originally constructed query and a query from the store that is identified by a search tool, as set forth in the claims.*

It is respectfully submitted that Ferrel fails to overcome the fundamental deficiencies noted above with respect to Molloy, and thus, the proposed combination of Molloy and Ferrel fails to render the claimed invention obvious. Moreover, there is no motivation to combine the teachings of these disparate references to arrive at the claimed invention.

In particular, Ferrel discloses an on-line publishing system for titles such as newspapers, journals, and the like. In the system of Ferrel, the title format (layout, design, etc.) is separated from the title content, thereby purportedly enabling ease of updating news stories, pictures, etc. without requiring updating of the entire title design. When displaying a title, the relevant section layouts are obtained first, and then populated using the appropriate content (e.g., articles, pictures, etc.) retrieved from a database. This content is retrieved from the database by searching according to predefined criteria. The predefined criteria are specified in "search objects" associated with a section/page layout, where each search object essentially includes a list of keywords and/or an indication of which directories to limit the search to (see, e.g., Col. 7, lines 31-40, Col. 16, lines 41-48 and Col. 25, lines 50-53). The text referred to in the Office Action relates to a number of tables including a "Search Object Table" which relates each query to a search object ID.

This search object table is alleged in the Office Action to meet the currently claimed feature of a store for storing database queries.

This characterization of Ferrel in the Office Action is simply incorrect. The search object table in Ferrel is used when displaying a title to obtain the queries which need to be run to retrieve the relevant content. The queries are obtained by mapping a list of identified search objects to the entries in the table (see, e.g., Col. 28, line 65 to Col. 29, line 7). It is manifestly clear that this is not the same as "searching the query store against a constructed query" as specifically recited in the claims, because the queries of Ferrel are retrieved from the table using a specified list of known ID values, and not in response to a search against a constructed query.

Moreover, the proposed combination of Molloy and Ferrel is entirely improper and is made in an impermissible hindsight manner. In particular, as explained above, the search object table in Ferrel associates a plurality of queries with specific identifiers. As such, this type of table is only suitable for use within a system which searches a store of database queries using known identifiers, which is not the case in Molloy, where different network problems encountered by the help desk mean that queries are input manually and will be different each time depending upon the situation and the operator. For at least this reason, the proposed combination would be entirely unsuitable. Moreover, it may be disadvantageous to provide a query store to save most of the queries performed on the database of Molloy because, as discussed above, the system of Molloy operates in a cyclical manner to narrow down the results from the database with the previous queries implicitly being discarded as being useless each time a set of results has been retrieved.

For at least this reason it would be inherently undesirable to save these redundant queries in a query store, and an additional step to search such a store would simply result in added cost and complexity of the system without any resulting benefit.

Additionally, it is inappropriate to combine the teachings of Molloy and Ferrel because of the completely disparate fields to which they relate. Molloy relates to an adaptive learning system for a case-based reasoning system, while Ferrel relates to an on-line publishing system, and in particular the section referred to in the Office Action relates to a table for mapping a list of identified queries which will be run to find the content when displaying a title on line. This combination would readily appear to one of skill in the art to be an inherently unsuitable combination.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the proposed combination of Molloy and Ferrel is improper. Moreover, even if, *arguendo*, the combination of Molloy and Ferrel were proper, the combination nevertheless fails to render the claimed invention obvious. For example, neither of the references, either singly or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest the feature of searching a query store against a constructed query or selecting between a constructed query and one located by the search of the query store. Accordingly, neither of the references, either singly or in combination, renders the claimed invention obvious. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully submitted.


In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the entire application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

CORLEY et al.  
Serial No.: 09/647,711

Should the Examiner deem that further issues require resolution prior to allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney of record at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.**

  
Updeep S. Gill  
Registration No. 37,334

USG:led

1100 North Glebe Road  
8<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Arlington, Virginia 22201  
Telephone: (703) 816-4000  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100